

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:)	
	:	Examiner: Ryan A. Lepisto
TOSHIHIKO OUCHI)	
	:	Group Art Unit: 2883
Application No.: 10/541,240)	
	:	
Filed: July 1, 2005)	
	:	
For: HIGH FREQUENCY)	
ELECTRICAL SIGNAL	:	
CONTROL DEVICE AND)	
SENSING SYSTEM	:	November 7, 2008

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Sir:

In response to the restriction requirement set forth in the Office Action dated October 9, 2008, Applicant provisionally elects to prosecute the Group I claims, namely Claims 31 to 42. The restriction requirement is, however, traversed.

Traversal is on the ground that there would not be undue burden in examining the two groups of claims in a single application. In particular, MPEP § 808 makes clear that in order to require restriction between independent or distinct inventions, reasons for insisting upon a restriction requirement, such as undue burden, must also be shown. In the present instance, it is not believed that there would be an undue burden in

examining the claims of Groups I and II in a single application, since the two groups of claims are not so different as would require a burden on the Examiner that is significantly beyond that of the normal burdens of examination.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the Restriction Requirement are respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Damond E. Vadnais/
Damond E. Vadnais
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 52,310

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FCIS_WS 2634715v1